



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,844	09/15/2000	Yasuyuki Susa	196824US0	2015

22850 7590 04/04/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

CORBIN, ARTHUR L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/662844

Applicant(s)

SUSA ET AL

Examiner

ARTHUR L. CORBIN

Group Art Unit

1761

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-6-03

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 7, 11, 12, 16-40 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) 19-23, 25-28, 31-34 & 37-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 7, 11, 12, 16-18, 23, 24, 29, 30, 35, 36 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

1. Claims 19-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 5.

2. Newly submitted claims 25-28, 31-34 and 37-40 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Applicant is referred to paragraph No. 6, Paper No. 4

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 25-28, 31-34 and 37-40 stand withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7, 11, 12, 16-18, ~~and~~ 23, 24, 29, 30, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susa et al or Soeda et al in view of Now⁵ad et al.

The primary references are described in paragraph Nos. 4 and 5, Paper No. 6.

Applicant is referred to the reasoning set forth in paragraph No. 7, Paper No. 6.

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Whereas applicant's specific range of ammonium salt concentration is not disclosed by the applied references, as applicant contends, a point within said range is disclosed by Now^Sad et al, i.e. 0.1 M ammonium chloride.

Applicant's comparative evidence, as set forth on pages 7-9 of the remarks, is ^{convincing.} not. Although such evidence indicates that applicant's claimed concentration is better than 0.2M, Now^Sad et al ^{discloses} ^{of} 0.1M ^{concentration} for ammonium chloride. Additionally, each primary reference, which is ^{absent} ^{est} ammonium chloride, produces results substantially equivalent to those ⁱⁿ ^{attained} by applicant's claimed solution (claim 7), as is evident from a comparison of Groups 4 and 5 with Groups 6 and 7 in Table 3 of the remarks. Thus, applicant's invention is no better than the closest prior art, viz. each primary reference.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1761

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Corbin whose telephone number is (703) 308-3850. The examiner can generally be reached on Tuesday--Friday from 10 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (703) 308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 305-7115 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A. Corbin/dh
April 2, 2003


ARTHUR L. CORBIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4-3-03